Claim 3 is not anticipated by Dahm. Dahm does not disclose "a storage media which stores a communication terminal ID assigned unique to each communication terminal used by a user and a personal ID assigned unique to each accessing user so that <u>the communication terminal ID and the personal ID are correlated</u> and <u>which stores personal information of the user</u> correlated with the personal ID," as recited in amended claim 3. That is, Dahm does not disclose a storage media that stores a communication terminal ID and personal information that is correlated with the personal ID, so that regardless of the number of the communication terminals used by the user, one personal ID is set for a user. See, e.g., col. 8, lines 5-23 and Figs. 2 and 3.

In contrast, the system of Dahm only discloses a data structure 300 wherein each record includes information about a subscriber, such as a device ID, subscriber ID, and the user information for the account. See e.g., Dahm, [0035] and Figure 3. Because Dahm does not correlate the communication terminal ID and personal information with the personal ID as recited in claim 3, Dahm does not disclose the claimed storage media.

Further, the system of Dahm does not disclose "an authentication means for allowing the user access to the personal information correlated with the personal ID of the user <u>by confirming the personal ID stored in the storage media based on a received communication terminal ID of the communication terminal of the user</u>, and identifying the user attempting to access an information source," as recited in claim 3.

In contrast, when a request is made to retrieve information about an account in the Dahm's system, either the device ID or the subscriber ID thereof must be provided. See, .e.g., Dahm, paragraph [0035]. Further, Dahm verifies the request to access to a user account by comparing a <u>device identification</u> from the client device with a corresponding <u>device identification</u> in the user account. See, e.g., Dahm, paragraph [0054]. Thus, Dahm does not disclose confirming the personal ID stored in the storage media based on a received

communication terminal ID of the communication terminal of the user and identifying the user attempting to access information source, as recited in claim 3.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed, claim 3 is patentable over Dahm. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B.   Claims 4-6

The Office Action rejects claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,065,120 to Laursen et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4-6 are not anticipated by Laursen. Laursen does not "retrieving a personal ID of the user based on the information terminal ID, identifying the user based on the personal ID retrieved, correlating personal information of the user based on the personal ID, and providing the user access to the personal information," as recited in independent claim 4.

In contrast, Laursen discloses that a user name and password control the authentication to enter the account in the database. See, e.g., Laursen, col. 8, lines 10-12. Thus, Laursen does not disclose retrieving a personal ID of the user based on the information terminal ID, which is assigned unique to each information terminal.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed, claim 4 is patentable over Laursen. Further, claims 5 and 6, which depend from claim 4, are patentable over Laursen for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 4, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 3-6 are earnestly solicited.